

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

In re:

CARMEN ASTRID BERGERON

Debtor.

CASE NO. C24-1682 MJP

Bankruptcy No. 23-12506-CMA

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION AND
MOTION TO STAY

CARMEN ASTRID BERGERON,

Defendant/Appellant,

v.

EDMUND J. WOOD, Trustee.

Plaintiff/Appellee.

This matter comes before the Court on Appellant's Motion for Reconsideration and Emergency Motion to Stay. (Dkt. Nos. 17, 18.) Having reviewed the Motions and all supporting materials, the Court DENIES the Motions.

Appellant asks the Court to reconsider its denial of her Motion for Leave to File Interlocutory Appeal. (Dkt. No. 16.)

1 In this District “[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored.” Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1).
2 “The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the
3 prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its
4 attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Id.

5 Appellant fails to demonstrate any basis on which to grant her Motion for
6 Reconsideration. First, Appellant again argues that the Bankruptcy Court’s Order she has
7 appealed is a final, appealable order. The Court has considered and rejected this same argument
8 and Appellant fails to identify any manifest error in the Court’s determination that the
9 Bankruptcy Court Order is non-final. (See Dkt. Nos. 9, 11.) Second, Appellant has not identified
10 any basis for reconsideration of the Court’s refusal to exercise its discretion to hear an
11 interlocutory appeal. She identifies no facts which could not have been brought to the Court’s
12 attention earlier or manifest error. Third, Appellant fails to show any manifest error in the
13 determination that she waived her request to file for interlocutory appeal. Appellant’s pro se
14 status does not excuse her compliance with the rules. See Am. Ass'n of Naturopathic Physicians
15 v. Hayhurst, 227 F.3d 1104, 1108 (9th Cir. 2000), as amended on denial of reh'g (Nov. 1, 2000);
16 Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino, 116 F.3d 379, 382 (9th Cir.1997) (acknowledging the rule
17 that “pro se litigants are not excused from following court rules”).

18 The Court finds no basis on which to grant reconsideration and DENIES the Motion for
19 Reconsideration. The Court also DENIES as MOOT Appellant’s Motion to Stay which was
20 premised on the issuance of a stay “pending resolution of the pending Motion for
21 Reconsideration.” (Mot. at 1 (Dkt. No. 18).) Given the Court’s present ruling on the Motion for
22 Reconsideration, the requested relief of a stay is unnecessary and therefore moot.

23 \\
24

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Appellant and all counsel.

2 Dated May 8, 2025.

3 

4 Marsha J. Pechman
5 United States Senior District Judge
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24